DELEGATED APPLICATIONS

ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO: **DC/24/0531: 61 Cleve Way Billingshurst.**

REPRESENTATION AND CONSULTATION RESPONSES:
Billingshurst Parish Council has stated no objection to this proposal.
Two representations of objection have been received in respect of this application.

ASSESSMENT:
1. The tree the subject of this application is a mature Horse chestnut that forms part of a line of trees retained in the rear gardens of the residential properties on Cleave Way when the area was developed in the late 1970s. The tree is T11 of TPO/0256, served on 12-06-1979.

2. From the east views of the tree are restricted due to the orientation of the properties on Cleave Way. Due west of the tree is a designated public right of way ref 3212. When viewed from this aspect, the tree is noticeable and positively contributes to the treescape. However, the presence of additional mature trees in the immediate area does restrict views of the tree in its entirety from further afield, and it is considered to have a fair level of very localised visual amenity value when viewed within the local landscape context.

3. This application has arisen following a full safety survey of the areas carried out on behalf of Hyde Housing. The applicants taking into account the proximity of these trees to nearby private residential and other premises, and thereby fulfilling their obligations as tree owners in respect of the 1957 and 1984 Occupiers' Liability Acts. The reasons stated for the removal are due to concerns with a large cavity on the main leading stem following a historical branch failure / tear out.

4. The tree has been subject to previous works to manage it for size and form regarding its location. It was fully floated at the time of inspection, displaying good leaf density and vigour. The wound on the main stem is large, at around 1000mm by 400mm. When struck with a sounding mallet in the area of the failure, there is a clear and distinct change in tone, suggesting that extensive internal decay is present in the main stem.

5. This tree species is well known for not being the greatest at compartmentalising, and often, decay is quick to set in following branch/stem failure. If the tree were retained, it would have to be heavily pruned or pollard repeatedly to ensure the public is safe from falling branches. This action would remove most of the branches and dramatically reduce the leaf cover. As such, when consideration is given to the number of foliage-bearing branches that would need to be removed, I am concerned that it may not be able to withstand such a high percentage of its photosynthetic volume being removed in one setting, and there would be a high risk that just the first pruning or pollarding the tree may likely die, due to its age and the extent of the works needed to retain it.

6. The level of work needed to maintain the tree in a safe and reasonable condition would drastically alter its appearance and result in a loss of amenities to the area, at least in the short and medium term, in much the same way its removal would. Hence, although it is regrettable to lose such a tree, which contributes positively to the area's green infrastructure, resting this application leaves the tree owner with a tree with a significant structural weakness within a high target area, an unreasonable action.

7. It is considered that the proposed works are reasonable and justified for the reasons provided, but it is accepted that its removal will result in some harm the character and amenities of the locality. Therefore, a replacement tree shall be secured by condition.

RECOMMENDATION:
Grant consent subject to the conditions below.

CONDITIONS TO BE APPLIED:

1. TR2	*Time limit, 2 years*
2. TR3	*Replacement (Single tree)*
3. TR4	*Surgery standards*
TINF1	*Note to applicant.*
TINF2	*Wildlife protection.*

DELEGATED

Authorising Officer sign……ANBU……***Arboricultural Officer (Strategic Planning).***

Date……28 Jun 24……